

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on April 16, 2007. Claims 1-21 were pending in the application, and the Examiner rejected all claims. With this amendment, claims 1, 2, and 7-18 are amended, claim 19 is canceled, and the remaining claims are unchanged in the application.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 7-17 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims were drawn to a data structure. With this amendment, claims 7-17 are amended to be dependent claims drawn to the method set out in independent claim 1. The claims more specifically define the step of reading localizable resource information. Therefore, the claims are now clearly drawn to patentable subject matter.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner also rejected claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-16, 18 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bennett US Pub. No. 2002/0052910 (hereinafter "Bennett"). Of the rejected claims, claims 1, 6 and 18 are independent claims. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection.

Independent claim 1 is drawn to a method for creating language-neutral and corresponding language-specific resource files. In order to meet this limitation, the Examiner cited the background portion of Bennett. However, that has nothing to do with creating language-neutral and language-specific resource files. Instead, the background of Bennett cited by the Examiner (and specifically paragraphs 5-7) simply discuss a system in which language-specific resource files already exist, and can be loaded by an operating system. It does not teach, suggest, or even mention, how these resource files are created in the first place. It certainly does not teach or suggest the manifest-based approach set out in independent claim 1.

Similarly, the remainder of Bennett discusses how to ensure that a version of the operating system, or an application, are consistent with the versions of the resource files that have already been created. Again, this has nothing to do with creating the language-neutral and language-specific portions of the resource file, in the first place.

It should also be noted that the inventors of the present application are well aware of the Bennett reference. In fact, the Bennett reference shares a number of inventors in common with the present application.

By contrast, independent claim 1 of the present application is drawn to “a method for creating language-neutral and language-specific resource files for a component.” The method includes “obtaining a resource manifest file; creating a language-neutral file and a language-specific resource file by reading localizable resource information contained in the resource manifest file, the localizable resource information specifying a location of a resource to be retrieved, a type of the resource to be retrieved, and indicating whether the resource is localizable; creating a checksum; and updating a field in the resource manifest file with the checksum data.” Not only is the background portion of Bennett, which is cited by the Examiner, directed to a system in which a plurality of language-specific resource libraries already exist, it makes no mention, whatsoever, of a resource manifest file. Nor does it teach or suggest, or even mention, that the language-neutral file and language-specific resource file are created by reading localizable resource information from the resource manifest file. It certainly does not specify the content of the resource manifest file, as set out in independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that Bennett neither teaches nor suggests independent claim 1, and independent claim 1 is allowable over Bennett.

Independent claim 6, which is unamended, is also allowable over Bennett. As discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, the portions of Bennett cited by the Examiner only discuss a system in which language-specific resource libraries already exist, and are simply loaded by the operating system. There is no teaching or suggestion, whatsoever, that a language-neutral file and a language-specific resource file is created based on “localizable resource information contained in [a] resource manifest file...”. Bennett does not teach or suggest the notion of a resource manifest file, and therefore it cannot anticipate independent claim 6.

Claims 7-17 further define the schema according to which the resource manifest file is stored. Because Bennett does not teach or suggest a resource manifest file, it cannot teach

or suggest such a file according to the schema claimed by claims 7-17. Therefore, Applicant submits that those claims are independently allowable.

Finally, independent claim 18 is drawn to a method for a component owner to provide component resource localization information. This is neither taught nor suggested by Bennett. Again, Bennett does not teach how a component owner can provide resource localization information, much less that it can be done by creating a resource manifest file and specifying a path for that file to a resource compiler program.

By contrast, independent claim 18 specifically includes “determining localizable resources; determining a localizable resource folder convention; creating a resource manifest file; and specifying a path for the resource manifest file, according to the resource folder convention, to a resource compiler program.” Since Bennett does not teach or suggest any type of resource manifest file, it cannot teach that a component owner provides localization information according to such a manifest file, as set out in independent claim 18. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 18 is allowable.

On pages 9 and 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4, 12, 17, and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over a combination of Bennett and either Wilkinson or Rettig. However, because these claims are dependent on allowable independent claims, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable as well.

In conclusion, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 6, and 18 are allowable over the references cited by the Examiner. Applicant further submits that claims 2-5, 7-17, and 20-21, which depend either directly or ultimately from the allowable independent claims, are allowable as well. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-18 and 20-21 are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Joseph R. Kelly, Reg. No. 34,847

900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319

Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

JRK:slg